



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

we find little that is definite. Only *sententiae* 1-152, he holds, belonged to the original collection; to cite but one bit of evidence for this view, one MS shows a subscription after 152. Who the author was and when the collection was put together Germann does not attempt to say.

To sum up, we have an interesting book, whose chief merit, apart from its orderly presentation of material, the excellence of its method, and its resolute refusal to claim more than the evidence warrants, lies in the demonstration of the close parallelism, in thought and language both, between the *sententiae* and the philosophical works of Seneca. Thus the belief of Germann's more immediate predecessors in the Varronian authorship of the collection is disproved, and demonstration is made that Teuffel-Schwabe's connection of the *sententiae* with Seneca is, at the least, very much more than a mere guess. It may be added, finally, that the *sententiae* are far from uninteresting in themselves. One oft-repeated thought is that no teacher can be of much value or power who listens to others merely that he may repeat *audita*.

CHARLES KNAPP

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Studi Graccani. By GIUSEPPE CARDINALI. Rome: E. Loescher & Co., 1912. Pp. iv+212.

This book contains four essays on the sources of the history of the Gracchi, the agrarian question in general, the provisions of the *lex Sempronia* and the history of its enforcement. Much has been written of late on this subject, and the critical acumen of the modern German school abundantly exhibited. Cardinali represents a somewhat more conservative tendency, and in discussing the sources of Gracchan history he takes issue with Meyer and Kornemann in particular in their assumption of a single source of the Latin tradition. He maintains that, while Posidonius is the source of the account in Diodorus and the *Auctor ad Herennium*, of the other accounts in Latin authors, in Plutarch and in Appian, there are three distinct Latin sources—the original Latin source of Appian, a pre-Ciceronian, and Livy. The last two appear fused in Valerius Maximus, Florus, Cassius Dio, and perhaps Velleius. The Livian tradition is quite foreign to Plutarch and the *Auctor ad Herennium*. In Plutarch we have the pre-Ciceronian and the original of Appian and perhaps others still.

Hardly any kind of investigation can lead to greater absurdities than that of sources, and Cardinali is to be congratulated on having exhibited more self-restraint and sanity of judgment than some of his predecessors. He refuses to accept Kornemann's Fannius, and does not attempt to eliminate entirely the element of individuality that may be found even in the most slavish of compilers. In general his criticisms are well taken, and his conclusions deserve careful attention. A good illustration of his skill in

argument is found on pp. 43-44, where he points out how impossible it would have been for any Roman in that stormy period to have risen so far above the strife of party as to write a wholly objective account of the struggle, which should afterward have been accepted as the only adequate source.

The second essay deals with the administration of the *ager publicus* before the Gracchan period, for the purpose of overthrowing Niese's contention that legislation fixing the amount of public land to be held by any individual dated only from a few years before 133 B.C., and formed no part of the Licinian laws of 367. Niese's view has been generally accepted, but Cardinali's discussion of the matter is keen, clear, and in the main convincing. He seems to have shown with reasonable certainty that some form of limitation was contained in the Licinian legislation.

In connection with the provisions of the *lex Sempronia*, Cardinali argues that *possessio* of the *ager publicus* had been enjoyed by *socii* as well as by *cives*, and that the process of confiscation of excess holdings by the state bore harder on the former than on the latter. He agrees with Lange and Beloch, against Mommsen, Kornemann, and Meyer, that *socii* did not participate in the new distribution.

In tracing the history of the *lex Sempronia*, Cardinali takes a position half-way between those who believe that the law was fully carried out, and those who think that, although the *ager publicus* was separated from that rightfully in the hands of individuals, little actual distribution took place. He also maintains with much plausibility that the *lex Thoria* of 111 B.C. was not a reactionary measure as is generally supposed.

S. B. P.

Thucydides, Book iv. Edited by A. W. SPRATT, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of St. Catherine's College, Cambridge. Cambridge: The University Press, 1912.

Book iv of Thucydides has been prepared on the same plan as Mr. Spratt's two other books in the "Pitt Press Series," namely Thuc. iii and vi. Below the text at the foot of the page are noted important variants, corrections, and conjectures—especially of Cobet, Hude, van Herwerden, Dobree, Rutherford, and others—although a complete *apparatus criticus* for the book has not been attempted. These footnotes are bare statements of fact. Brief arguments or discussions on disputed points of text are given, when deemed necessary, in connection with the explanatory notes, not reserved for a critical appendix at the end. In fact the appendix—only four pages—is devoted mainly to historical questions. The introduction, which is short—only ten pages—discusses "The Prelude to the Ten Years' War." The explanatory notes are very brief, as a rule, but consistently helpful. Admirable especially are those of an informational character, which on the first mention of an important place give a concise statement of